arXiv:1403.8109v1 [math.CO] 27 Mar 2014

RESEARCH PROPOSAL: SPROUTING GRAPHS

Johan Kok[1]

Abstract

This is an introduction to the concept of finite directed graphs which are cloned on a time line from *genetically known* simple undirected connected graphs on at least two vertices. The idea of *sprouting* could remind of neurological growth of good or malicious networks. Since complete graphs, paths and possibly cycles amongst others, form part of the *skeleton* of all graphs, it is thought that the introduction to sprouting results in regard of these family of graphs will lay an interesting foundation.This proposal is meant for *exploratory research*. (See open problems and the remark at the end of the proposal).

Keywords: Sprouting graph, Directed graph, Longest path, Longest cycle, Arc weight, Maturity weight

AMS Classification Numbers: 05C07, 05C12, 05C20, 05C38, 05C70

1 Introduction

This is an introduction to the concept of Sprouting Graphs, which are finite directed graphs cloned on a time line from *genetically known* simple undirected connected graphs on at least two vertices. The idea of *sprouting* could remind of neurogical growth of good or malicious networks. Consider a simple undirected connected graph G on $n \geq 2$ vertices. Let all vertices carry the default label v. Randomly indice the vertices $v_i, i = 1, 2, 3, ..., n$. Call the indice pattern ℓ_α. Note that a graph on n vertices has $n!$ possible indice patterns.

Also reduce an edge $v_iv_j \in E(G)$ to a sprout ij if and only if $i < j$ or ji if and only if $j < i$. The directed Sprouting Graph $G^s_{t\in\mathbb{T}_{\ell_\alpha}}$ evolves on the time line $t \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell_\alpha} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, 3, ..., m\}$ with $m = max_{\forall i,j}|i - j|_{v_i,v_j\in V(G)}$ as per definition 1.1. It implies that at $t = 0$ the graph G

[1]**Affiliation of author:**
Johan Kok (Tshwane Metropolitan Police Department), City of Tshwane, Republic of South Africa
e-mail: kokkiek2@tshwane.gov.za

has been reduced to an edgeless graph with sprouts $ij, \forall v_i v_j \in V(G)$ and $i < j$ attached to vertex v_i. Note that the number of sprouts attached to v_i at $t = 0$ is equal to $d^+(v_i)$ in $G^s_{t=m}$.

Definition 1.1. *In a Sprouting Graph $G^s_{t\in\mathbb{T}_{\ell_\alpha}}$ an arc, (v_i, v_j) evolves from the sprout ij and arcs at time $t = |i - j|$ with, $t \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell_\alpha} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, 3, ..., m\}$ with $m = max_{\forall i,j}|i - j|_{v_i,v_j\in V(G)}$.*

Definition 1.2. *Those vertices in a matured Sprouting Graph $G^s_{t=m}$, having $d(v_i) = d^-(v_i)$ are called* adult vertices, *and the set of adult vertices is denoted, $\mathbb{A}(G^s_{t=m})$.*

Lemma 1.1. *All matured Sprouting Graphs $G^s_{t=m}$, cloned from a simple undirected connected graph G on at least two vertices have at least one adult vertex.*

Proof. Since a sprout $ni, i \leq (n-1)$ can never exist, we have $d(v_n) = d^-(v_n)$ in $G^s_{t=m}$. □

Definition 1.3. *The arc-weight of an arc (v_i, v_j) is defined to be $w(v_i, v_j) = j - i$, and if all arcs are labelled $e_\ell, \ell = 1, 2, 3, ..., \epsilon(G^s_{t=m})$ the maturity weight of $G^s_{t=m}$, is defined to be $mw(G^s_{t=m}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\epsilon(G^s_{t=m})} w(e_\ell)$.*

It follows easily that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\epsilon(G^s_{t=m})} w(e_\ell)$ is not always a constant and depends on the random indicing of the vertices of a simple undirected connected graph G, so $min \sum_{\ell=1}^{\epsilon(G^s_{t=m})} w(e_\ell) \leq max \sum_{\ell=1}^{\epsilon(G^s_{t=m})} w(e_\ell)$.

2 Sprouting of Complete Graphs, Paths and Cycles

Since complete graphs, paths and possibly cycles amongst others, form part of the *skeleton* of all graphs, it is thought that the introduction to sprouting results within these classes of graphs will entice further results.

Proposition 2.1. *For the complete graph K_n we have that* $mw(K^s_{n,t=m}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-3}(n-i) + ... + \sum_{i=1}^{n-(n-1)}(n-i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n-j}(n-i)$.

Proof. Consider the complete graph K_n. Indice any vertex as v_1 and randomly indice the other vertices $v_2, v_3, ..., v_n$. Now consider the matured Sprouting Graph $K^s_{n,t=m}$. Regardless of the random indicing of the vertices we have the following arc-weights,

$w(v_1, v_{i_{(i=2,3,...,n)}}) = 1_{(i.r.o.v_2)}, = 2_{(i.r.o.v_3)}, = 3_{(i.r.o.v_4)}, ..., = (n-2)_{(i.r.o.v_{n-1})}, = (n-1)_{(i.r.o.v_n)}$
$w(v_2, v_{i_{(i=3,4,...,n)}}) = 1_{(i.r.o.v_3)}, = 2_{(i.r.o.v_4)}, = 3_{(i.r.o.v_5)}, ..., = (n-2)_{(i.r.o.v_n)}$
.
.
.
$w(v_{n-1}, v_{i_{(i=n)}}) = 1_{(i.r.o.v_n)}$.

By summing all columns carrying equal arc-weights, across all rows the result $mw(K^s_{n,t=m}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-3}(n-i) + ... + \sum_{i=1}^{n-(n-1)}(n-i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n-j}(n-i)$, follows. □

Corollary 2.2. *For the complete graph K_n we have that* $mw(K^s_{n,t=m}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-3}(n-i) + ... + \sum_{i=1}^{n-(n-1)}(n-i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n-j}(n-i)$, *for all indice patterns ℓ_α, ($n!$ indice patterns).*

Proof. Indice any vertex of K_n with the number 1. Randomly indice the remaining vertices 2, 3, ..., n. Due to complete *connectivity* the results follows trivially. □

Corollary 2.3. *The complete sprouting graph $K^s_{n,t=m}$ has a unique adult vertex, v_n so $\mathbb{A} = \{v_n\}$.*

Proof. Since any vertex $v_i, i < n$ is always linked to v_n, the vertex v_i will always have $d^+(v_i) \geq 1$ in $K^s_{n,t=m} \Rightarrow d^-(v_i) < d(v_i)$. Since it contradicts definition 1.2 the result follows from Lemma 1.1. □

Lemma 2.4. *For a simple undirected connected graph G on n vertices we have $max(mw(G^s_{t=m})) \leq min(mw(K^s_{n,t=m})) = max(mw(K^s_{n,t=m}))$.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.2 that $min(mw(K^s_{n,t=m})) = max(mw(K^s_{n,t=m}))$. Since $|\epsilon(K_n)| \geq |\epsilon(G)|, G$ on n vertices, the removal of edges from K_n to obtain G results in reducing the corresponding terms in the summation $mw(K^s_{n,t=m}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(n-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-3}(n-i) + ... + \sum_{i=1}^{n-(n-1)}(n-i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n-j}(n-i)$, to zero. Therefore, $max(mw(G^s_{t=m})) \leq min(mw(K^s_{n,t=m})) = max(mw(K^s_{n,t=m}))$. □

Proposition 2.5. *For the path $P_n, n \geq 2$, we have that $min(mw(P^s_{n,t=m})) = n-1$, and $max(mw(P^s_{n,t=m})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i$.*

Proof. (Part 1): Conceptualise the path $P_n, n \geq 2$ as the graph with the n vertices seated on a horisontal line. Indice the leftmost *end vertex*, v_1 and the rightmost *end vertex*, v_n. Begin from the left, and indice the other vertices consectutively $v_2, v_3, ..., v_{n-1}$. Call the indice pattern ℓ_1. Clearly, $m = max_{\forall i,j}|i-j|_{v_i,v_j \in V(P_n)} = 1$, hence $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1} = \{0, 1\}$. Therefore all arcs having arc-weight = 1, arc at $t = 1$. Since there are exactly $(n-1)$ such arcs in $P^s_{n,t=1}$, the first part of the result follows.

(Part 2): Conceptualise the path P_n as in Part 1. Beginning at v_1, indice the other vertices sequencially as, $v_1, v_n, v_2, v_{n-1}, ..., v_j, v_{j+1}$ if n is even and, $v_1, v_n, v_2, v_{n-1}, ..., v_{j+1}, v_j$ if n is odd. Call the indice pattern ℓ_2. Clearly the $n-1$ arc-weights run through 1, 2, 3, ..., $(n-1)$. It follows that $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_2} = \{0, 1, 2, ..., n-1\}$. Since the indice pattern ensures maximal differences between adjacent vertices the result $max(mw(P^s_{n,t=m})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i$, follows. □

Corollary 2.6. *For the path P_n we have $min(mw(P^s_{2,t=1})) = max(mw(P^s_{2,t=1}))$ and, $min(mw(P^s_{n,t=(n-1)})) < max(mw(P^s_{n,t=(n-1)})), n \geq 3$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Proposition 2.5. □

Proposition 2.7. *For the cycle $C_n, n \geq 4$, we have that $min(mw(C^s_{n,t=m})) = 2(n-1)$, and $max(mw(C^s_{n,t=m})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.*

Proof. (Part 1): Conceptualise the path $C_n, n \geq 4$ as the graph with the n vertices seated on the circumference of a circle with a vertex seated centre at the top. Indice the *top vertex*, v_1 and indice the other vertices clockwise $v_2, v_3, ..., v_n$. Call the indice pattern ℓ_1. Clearly, the acrc weights, $w(v_i, v_j) = 1$ except for, $w(v_1, v_n) = n-1$ hence $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1} = \{0, 1, (n-1)\}$. Therefore all arcs having arc-weight = 1, arc at $t = 1$. Since there are exactly $(n-1)$ such arcs in $C^s_{n,t=1}$ and the arc (v_1, v_n) arcs at $t = (n-1)$, the first part of the result follows.

(Part 2): Conceptualise the cycle C_n as in Part 1. Beginning at v_1, indice the other vertices clockwise as, $v_1, v_n, v_2, v_{n-1}, ..., v_j, v_{j+1}$ if n is even and, $v_1, v_n, v_2, v_{n-1}, ..., v_{j+1}, v_j$ if n is odd. Call the indice pattern ℓ_2. Clearly, the n arc-weights run through 1, 2, 3, ..., $(n-1), (\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ repeated). It follows that $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_2} = \{0, 1, 2, ..., \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, ..., n-1\}$. Since the indice pattern ensures maximal differences between adjacent vertices the result $max(mw(C^s_{n,t=m})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, follows. □

Corollary 2.8. *For the cycle C_n we have $min(mw(C^s_{3,t=1})) = max(mw(C^s_{3,t=1}))$ and, $min(mw(C^s_{n,t=(n-1)})) < max(mw(C^s_{n,t=(n-1)})), n \geq 4$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Proposition 2.7. □

It has been established that if two different random indice patterns of a graph G say ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 result in $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_2}$ respectively, such that $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1} = \mathbb{T}_{\ell_2}$ then, $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1} = \mathbb{T}_{\ell_2} \nRightarrow mw(G^s_{t=m_{\ell_1}}) = mw(G^s_{t=m_{\ell_2}})$. However, it is *conjectured* by *Kok* that if $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\ell_2}$ then $mw(G^s_{t=m_{\ell_1}}) < mw(G^s_{t=m_{\ell_2}})$.

3 Sprouting Complete Bipartite Graphs, $K^s_{(1,n)t=m}$

Theorem 3.1. *The sprouting bipartite graph $K^s_{(1,n),t=m}$ has:*

(i)

$$min(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m})) = \begin{cases} 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i) + \lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil, & \text{if } n \geq 3 \text{ and uneven} \\ 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i), & \text{if } n \geq 2 \text{ and even} \end{cases}$$

(ii) $max(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} i, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. (i) (Part 1): Consider the graph $K_{(1,3)}$. In the ordered pair $(1,3)$ we call the vertex corresponding to the entry 1, the *nodal vertex* and those corresponding to the entry 3, we call *leaf vertices (leafs)*. Note that in the table that follows; $i,j,k,\ell \in \{1,2,3,4\}$. The 4! indice patterns with the corresponding values $mw(K^s_{(1,3)})$ are tabled.

nodal v_i	*leaf* v_j	*leaf* v_k	*leaf* v_ℓ	$mw(K^s_{(1,3),t=m})$
1	2	3	4	6
1	2	4	3	6
1	3	2	4	6
1	3	4	2	6
1	4	2	3	6
1	4	3	2	6
2	1	3	4	4
2	1	4	3	4
2	3	1	4	4
2	3	4	1	4
2	4	1	3	4
2	4	3	1	4
3	1	2	4	4
3	1	4	2	4
3	2	1	4	4
3	2	4	1	4
3	4	1	2	4
3	4	2	1	4
4	1	2	3	6
4	1	3	2	6
4	2	1	3	6
4	2	3	1	6
4	3	1	2	6
4	3	2	1	6

Clearly $min(mw(K^s_{(1,3),t=2})) = 4 = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(3+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i) + \lceil\frac{(3+1)}{2}\rceil$. So the results holds for $K_{(1,3)}$. Assume it holds for $K_{(1,q)}, q > 3$ and q *uneven*. Hence, it is assumed that $min(mw(K^s_{(1,q),t=m})) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i)+\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil$. Now consider the graph $K_{(1,(q+2))}$. We have that $\lceil\frac{(q+2)+1}{2}\rceil = \lceil\frac{(q+1)+2}{2}\rceil = \lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil + 1$. So the *nodal vertex* indice increases to $\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil + 1$. This results in the *nodal vertex*, $v_{\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil}$ in $K_{(1,q)}$ to become a *leaf* in $K_{(1,(q+2))}$, and vertex $v_{(\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil+1)}$ becomes *nodal* in $K_{(1,(q+2))}$. Thus, for all $v_i, i < \lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil$ in $K_{(1,q)}$, the difference $|\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil - i|$ increases by 1 in $K_{1,(q+2)}$. The value $|(\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil + 1) - \lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil|$ repeats twice due to the indice interchange of the *nodal vertex*. Then *exact* mirror values follow with the value $\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil + 1 = \lceil\frac{(q+2)+1}{2}\rceil$,

added as well. Hence the result (part 1) holds for $K_{(1,q)}, q > 3$ and q *uneven*. So it follows in general that $min(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m})) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i) + \lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil$, if $n \geq 3$ and *uneven*.

(i) (Part 2): Consider the graph $K_{(1,2)}$. Note that in the table that follows; $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The 3! indice patterns with the corresponding values $mw(K^s_{(1,2)})$ are tabled.

nodal v_i	*leaf* v_j	*leaf* v_k	$mw(K^s_{(1,2),t=m})$
1	2	3	3
1	3	2	3
2	1	3	2
2	3	1	2
3	1	2	3
3	2	1	3

Clearly $min(mw(K^s_{(1,2),t=1})) = 2 = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(2+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i)$. So the results holds for $K_{(1,2)}$. Assume it holds for $K_{(1,q)}, q > 2$ and q *even*. Hence, it is assumed that $min(mw(K^s_{(1,q),t=m})) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i)$. Now consider the graph $K_{(1,(q+2))}$. As in (i) (Part 1) we have that $\lceil\frac{(q+2)+1}{2}\rceil = \lceil\frac{(q+1)+2}{2}\rceil = \lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil + 1$. So the *nodal vertex* indice increases to $\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil + 1$. This results in the *nodal vertex*, $v_{\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil}$ in $K_{(1,q)}$ to become a *leaf* in $K_{(1,(q+2))}$, and vertex $v_{(\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil+1)}$ becomes *nodal* in $K_{(1,(q+2))}$. Thus, for all $v_i, i < \lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil$ in $K_{(1,q)}$, the difference $|\lceil\frac{(q+1)}{2}\rceil - i|$ increases by 1 in $K_{1,(q+2)}$. Similarly to the closing reasoning of (i) (Part 1), the result follows.

(ii) By indicing the *nodal vertex*, v_1 and the *leafs*, $v_2, v_3, ..., v_{n+1}$ the result follows similarly to the proof of (i). □

Corollary 3.2. *For the sprouting graph* $K^s_{(1,n),t=m}$ *the* nodal vertex *is indiced* ℓ *with:*

$$\ell \in \begin{cases} \{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil, \lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil + 1\}, & \textit{for } min(mw(K^s_{(1,n)}) \textit{ if } n \geq 3 \textit{ and uneven} \\ \{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil\}, & \textit{for } min(mw(K^s_{(1,n)}) \textit{ if } n \geq 3 \textit{ and even} \\ \{1, n+1\}, & \textit{for } max(mw(K^s_{(1,n)}) \end{cases}$$

Proof. (Parts 1 and 2): If n is *uneven* then $n+1$ is *even*. This results in two *nodal indices* namely, $\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil$ and $\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil+1$ allowing *minimal* mirror image vertex indice differences hence, $min(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m}) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i) + \lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil = 2(\sum_{i=\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1}^{n+1} |(\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil+1) - i|) + \lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil$.

If n is *even* then $n+1$ is *uneven*. This results in the unique *nodal vertex indice* allowing *minimal* mirror image vertex indice differences to be exactly, $\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil$. Hence, $min(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m}) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1} i) = 2(\sum_{i=\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil-1}^{n+1} |\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil - i|)$.
Hence the result:

$$\ell \in \begin{cases} \{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil, \lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil+1\}, & \text{for } min(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m}) \text{ if } n \geq 3 \text{ and uneven} \\ \{\lceil\frac{(n+1)}{2}\rceil\}, & \text{for } min(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m}) \text{ if } n \geq 3 \text{ and even,} \end{cases}$$

follows.

(Part 3:) Since $|1-(i+1)|_{\forall i\in\{2,3,\ldots,n\}} = |(n+1)-i|_{\forall i\in\{1,2,\ldots,n-1\}}$ and assures *maximal vertex indice differences* the result $\ell \in \{1, n+1\}$ for determining $max(mw(K^s_{(1,n),t=m})$ follows. □

[Open problem: Is it possible to always find an indice pattern for the vertices of a simple undirected connected graph, resulting in a Sprouting Graph with a unique adult vertex ?]
[Open problem: Prove or disprove *Kok's pattern conjecture* namely, if two different random indice patterns of a graph G say ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 result in $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_2}$ respectively, then $\mathbb{T}_{\ell_1} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\ell_2} \Rightarrow mw(G^s_{t=m_{\ell_1}}) < mw(G^s_{t=m_{\ell_2}})$.]
[Open problem: What is $min(mw(K^s_{(r_1,r_2,r_3,\ldots,r_n),t=m}))$ and $max(mw(K^s_{(r_1,r_2,r_3,\ldots,r_n),t=m}))$ with $K_{(r_1,r_2,r_3,\ldots,r_n)}, 2 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq r_3 \leq \ldots \leq r_n, \forall r_i \in \mathbb{N}$, being a complete n-partite graph ?]
[Open problem: Describe an algorithm to determine $max(mw(T^s_{t=m}))$, T a tree.]
[Open problem: If possible, rework the proof of Theorem 3.1 to improve its mathematical elegancy.]
[Open problem: Conceptualise a Sprouting Graph G on n vertices and indiced i_j such that, $i_1 < i_2, ... < i_n$ and $i_j \in \mathbb{N}$. Determine $max(mw(G^s_{t=m}))$ and $min(mw(G^s_{t=m}))$ in general.]

Open access: This research proposal is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

References (Limited)

[1] Bondy, J.A., Murty, U.S.R., *Graph Theory with Applications,* Macmillan Press, London, (1976).
[2] Arikati, S.R., Rangan, C.P, *Linear algorithm for optimal path cover problem on interval graphs,* Information Processing Letters, Vol 35(3), (1990): pp 149-153.
[3] Bulterman, R.W., Van der Sommen, F.W., Zwaan, G., Verhoeff, T., Van Gasteren, A.J.M., Feijen, W.H.J., *On computing a longest path in a tree,* Information Processing Letters, Vol 81(2), (2002): pp 93-96.
[4] Damaschke, P., *Paths in interval graphs and circular arc graphs,* Discrete Mathematics, Vol 112 (1-3), (1993): pp 49-64.
[5] Karger, D.R., Motwani, R., Ramkumar, G.D.S., *On approximating the longest path in a graph,* Algorithmica, Vol 18, (1997): pp 82-98.
[6] Mertzios, G.B., Corneil, D.G., *A Simple Polynomial Algorithm for the Longest Path Problem on Cocomparability Graphs,* arXiv: 1004.4560v1 [cs.DM], 26 April 2010.
[7] Rautenbach, D., Sereni, J-S., *Transversals of Longest Paths and Cycles,* arXiv: 1302.5503v1 [math.CO], 22 February 2013.

[It is hoped to attract a significant number of co-authors to a series of papers on Sprouting Graphs or other topical results evolving from it. Co-authors are invited to notify their interest at kokkiek2@tshwane.gov.za as soon as possible following the arXiv date stamp, else research may be independent as well. However, joining the project remains open-ended. The project protocol will be communicated via e-mail to all co-authors notifying their interest.]